

REMARKS

Claim 1-5, 7-12 and 14-18 have been canceled.

Claims 6, 13 and 19 have been amended to broaden the claims.

In response to the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the rejection is moot in view of the canceling of that claim. In response to the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-18 and 20-21 under 35 USC 102(b), the rejection is moot in view of the canceling of all those claims.

In response to the rejection of claims 2, 9 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a), the rejection is moot in view of the canceling of all those claims.

In response to the rejection of claims 6, 13 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable the article entitled "A real-time foveated multiresolution system for low-bandwidth video communication" by Geisler et. al. (Geisler), the citation does not suggest the elements of claims 6, 13 and 19. More specifically Geisler does not suggest "the second region on the video screen is dimmer than the first region on the video screen" as in claims 6, 13 and 19 as amended. The dimming of the second region of lower resolution is not suggested anywhere in the citation. The dimming provides an indication of the position of the second region on the screen that is more recognizable than the reduced resolution provides. Dimming is not equivalent to reducing the resolution of the image.

The claims are definite and distinguished from the citations and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael E. Belk  
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357  
Patent Attorney  
(914) 333-9643

us010117.am2.doc